

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-29. Claims 1-9, 11-19, and 21-28 are amended herein without prejudice. No new matter has been added. Support for Claim 1-9, 11-19, and 21-28 amendments can be found in the instant specification at least at page 9, lines 13-22, page 10, line 17 – page 11, line 9, and FIG. 2.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1–29

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent 6,418,466 by Bertram et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Bertram”). Applicants have reviewed Bertram and respectfully submit that the claimed embodiments are not anticipated by Bertram for at least the following rationale.

According to MPEP 2131, “to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Further, as cited in MPEP 2131, “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Additionally, according to MPEP 2131, “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as the claims are neither taught nor suggested by Bertram. Amended independent Claim 1 recites (emphasis added),

A method for controlling access in an interactive grid environment comprising:

receiving a request from a user, wherein said request comprises at least one requested application;

determining user policies based on a classification of said user, wherein said user policies limit resources available to said user;

determine a remote executable node, wherein said remote executable node is configured to execute a session for said user;

providing a dynamic user account, wherein said dynamic user account is automatically customized based on said user policies;

reserving said executable node and said at least one requested application; and

establishing a session between said user and said remote execution node, wherein said session is configured to limit resources permitted by said user policies.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bertram does not teach, among other things, “reserving said executable node and said at least one requested application,” as recited by Claim 1.

Conversely, in Bertram, a different method of user policies is used. The Applicants understand Bertram to teach a “method of discovering native or non-native authentication server domains and managing information about such domains in a computer network,” [Abstract]. More specifically, “[t]he present invention thus implements “dynamic” local accounts on the client machine. A dynamic local account is a user account that is created on the local Windows NT workstation when a user logs on to a location other than a Windows NT. As discussed above, a local account is created after the user is successfully

authenticated on the remote logon server. The account gives the user valid security credentials on the local workstation,” [Col. 11, lines 43-51]. Applicants understand Bertram to create a local account on a client machine, where the client machine may be accessed by a user, which is different than “reserving said executable node and said at least one requested application,” as claimed.

As Applicants submit that Bertram does not teach each and every element of the independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 overcomes the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection as being anticipated by Bertram. As such, Claim 1 is allowable as it overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Similarly, as independent Claims 11 and 21 have similar elements as Claim 1, Claims 11 and 21 should overcome the rejection under 102(b) for similar reasons as Claim 1, and are allowable.

The dependent Claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-29 which depend on the independent Claims 1, Claims 11 and 21, respectively, should also overcome the rejection under 102(b) for similar reasons as Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-29 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims, and reciting additional features.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully requests allowance of the now allowable Claims 1-29.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: 08/27/2008

/John P. Wagner, Jr./
John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

WESTRIDGE BUSINESS PARK
123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE
WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95076

Telephone: (408) 377-0500 Voice
(408) 234-3749 Direct/Cell
(831) 722-2350 Facsimile